

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 35-38, and 40-60 are pending, with claims 1 and 35 being independent. Claims 24-34 are cancelled. Claim 60 is added. Support for the new claim is found throughout the specification, *see, e.g., page 22 line 11 to page 24 line 4*. No new matter has been added.

Claims 13 and 59:

Claims 13 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Amendments are made in view of this rejection which are believed to fully address the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant requests that this rejection being withdrawn.

Claims 1, 8-13, 15, 22-28, 35-38, and 40-55:

Claims 1, 8-13, 15, 22-28, 35-38, 40-55, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Waesterlid (U.S. 6,993,325). Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, with emphasis added, a computer implemented method of sharing static data resources associated with a group among members of the group that includes storing a single copy of member-only static data resources associated with a group in a host system, sharing the single copy of data resources with a group member only when the member successfully logins into the host system and initiates access to the stored single copy of data resource.

Notably, while not intended as limiting, examples of “sharing the single copy of data resources with a group member only when the member successfully logins into the host system and initiates access to the stored single copy of data resource,” can be found throughout the specification. For example, the host system maintains a single copy of shared data files, such as text files, audio files, image files, video files and/or multi-medial files. Some other examples of shared data resources include a shared photo gallery, a shared map, or a shared calendar. *see, e.g. page 22, line 4 – page 23, line 26.*

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102(e) rejection over Waesterlid because Waesterlid fails to describe or suggest at least the feature of “sharing

the single copy of data resources with a group member only when the member successfully logs into the host system and initiates access to the stored single copy of data resource,” as recited in amended claim 1.

By contrast, Waesterlid describes “... a status reporting method that allows members of an affinity group to send status information to and receive status information from other members of the affinity group”, *see, Waesterlid Col 1, lines 63 – 66*. More specifically, Waesterlid’s affinity group members share status information by sending each other status update messages. Waesterlid does not contemplate members logging to the host system to access shared information.

On the contrary, Wasterlid teaches away from the claimed approach, clearly suggesting an alternative to the claimed approach, even discourage adoption of an approach involving user login. (See Waesterlid’s application, which indicated that its goal is to satisfy “... a need for a communication method that allows members of an affinity group to receive up to date status information about other group members without having to log into a server” col. 1: 55 – 59, emphasis added). Thus, Waesterlid members never need to “successfully logins into the host system” to obtain shared data, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Waesterlid’s member does not initiate access to obtain shared data. Rather, in Waesterlid, each member passively reacts to data received. “When the Group Update message is received by a member, the client application on the member’s communication device 100 takes appropriate action to add, delete, or modify member records...” *see, Waesterlid, Col. 8:53- 28*. Thus Waesterlid does not “initiate access to the stored single copy of data resource” as recited in claim 1.

Finally, in Waesterlid, the shared status information is duplicated in multiple copies, with each member receiving its own copy of the shared data, e.g., status update information of the group. In other words, each member in Waesterlid has its own copy of shared data, whereas group members are said to access one single copy of data in claim 1. Clearly, Waesterlid’s members do not “shar[e] the single copy of data resources” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Waesterlid does not disclose or properly suggest at least the “sharing the single copy of data resources with a group member only when the member successfully logins

into the host system and initiates access to the stored single copy of data resource” feature, as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Waesterlid.

Accordingly, based on the above amendments and remarks, independent claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Notably, this feature was added by this amendment. Thus the Office Action does not presently allege that Waesterlid discloses the foregoing feature. Should this rejection be maintained, Applicant therefore request an explanation of how Waesterlid meets the specifics of this feature.

Like claim 1, independent claim 35 recites, a “computer program, stored on a computer readable medium, comprising instructions for: storing a single copy of member-only static data resources associated with a group; sharing the single copy of data resources with a group member only when the member successfully logins into the host system and initiates access to the stored single copy of data resource;”

In accordance with the above, claim 35 is believed allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 2-7, 14, 16-21, 56-57, and 59

Claim 2-7, 14, 16-21, 56-57, and 59 are dependant claims of independent claim 1 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waesterlid in view of Sonnenreich. Based on the reasons above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that Waesterlid does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 2-7, 14, 16-21, 56-57, and 59.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the entire application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant : Catherine Tornabene et al.
Serial No. : 09/810,625
Filed : March 19, 2001
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-114001 / Community 05

No fee is believed to be due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/21/2002



W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40443445.doc